

Page 1

YUCCA MOUNTAIN SCOPING MEETING
PUBLIC COMMENTS

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Taken at the Longstreet Inn & Casino
Highway 373
Amargosa Valley, Nevada

On Monday, May 3, 2004
At 4:00 p.m.

Reported by: Wanda L. McInerney, CCR 676, RPR

Page 3

JEFF TAGUCHI

MR. TAGUCHI: My name is Jeff, J-e-f-f,
Taguchi, T-a-g-u-c-h-i, consultant.

In my view obviously nuclear waste needs to
stay off the highways. It needs to stay completely off
the highways. The current plan indicates there's going
to be a period of time in which there is going to be a
window of about six years where nuclear waste will have
to be transported down the highway due to time frames
and construction.

I was not necessarily a proponent of the
Caliente route due to the obstacles and things like that
that are necessary in the way of the cost. I believe
the Mineral County route is a more economical acceptable
means.

I have spoke with representatives of Mineral
County and representatives who represented the Walker
River Indian Reservation, and there are opportunities
out there still available which would provide a route
that's not only cheaper, but also a lot quicker to
construct.

But my main point is that nuclear waste needs
to stay off the highways. Okay.

A STAFF PERSON: Thank you.

Page 2

BOB SWADELL

MR. SWADELL: Bob Swadell, S-w-a-d-e-l-l,

First off I'd like to say I have no objection
to the nuclear repository. I think it's necessary. It
should be done.

I believe that the Caliente Railway route is
probably the largest single fraud ever committed on the
United States. It's been lobbied heavily. It's been
done. They got the job done, but there is a direct
route from Hawthorne, down to Tonopah, all under old
existing road bed.

The cost of the other one to go over three
mountain ranges will be somewhere between 900 million
and probably 1.2 billion and will take six years or
longer to build.

The Hawthorne route should have been
considered. The Mineral County people put a resolution
in to Margaret Chu, and I mean that's really my basic
comments. I just think it's totally fraudulent. And
that's from a taxpayer's standpoint even though it's DOE
money. And that ought to do it.

I'll see you.

A STAFF PERSON: Thank you.

Page 4

ALBERT VERRILLI

MR. VERRILLI: Albert Verrilli,
V-e-r-r-i-l-l-i.

With regard to the construction of the
railroad, I wanted to recommend that construction begin
at the Yucca Mountain site and work backwards, if not in
both directions, at least there first because that would
allow supplies for the construction of the depository
itself to receive truck shipments from Highway 95, and
then they could merge, they could meet there, and that
would facilitate, you know, getting those supplies to
Yucca Mountain, and also that would leave a line
connected to our principal transportation route through
Nye County that perhaps at some time be used for some
other future benefit with dual use. That's one of the
things that turned out the railroad was available to
support.

That's it.

A STAFF PERSON: Thank you.

ALEX MENDEZ

MR. MENDEZ: Alex Mendez. I am the grant
writer for the Nye County School District.

I guess I could summarize our concerns based
on the fact that we have a lot of schools in close

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

Page 5

1 proximity to the proposed transportation route of the
 2 nuclear dump that are really, really in bad shape.
 3 We have -- for example, Amargosa Elementary
 4 School, we have about 160 kids in that school. It's a K
 5 through 8 school, and the school is composed of nothing
 6 but temporary structures, module units, mobiles, that
 7 type of thing.
 8 Amargosa, as you know, is about five miles
 9 from the test site, and I don't know the proximity to
 10 the railroad line that the Yucca Mountain is proposing,
 11 but it is awfully, awfully close. It is probably within
 12 10 miles of that school site.
 13 Should there be any kind of a spill in that
 14 area, the school kids would be absolutely devastated.
 15 Those structures do not offer any in-shelter support for
 16 that -- for the kids' safety, and, you know, they would
 17 perish.
 18 And it's a similar situation in Pahrump. We
 19 have two schools. Pahrump is a little further away. I
 20 think it's probably within the 40-mile, 50-mile radius
 21 from that Yucca Mountain site, but we have two schools
 22 again with temporary structures.
 23 Should there be any terrorist attack on those
 24 shipments, should there be any terrorist attacks such as
 25 a chemical explosion, such as biological explosion,

Page 6

1 again, we don't have facilities that could offer
 2 in-shelter service for these kids. And in Pahrump you
 3 have Manse Elementary School, which has about 500 kids.
 4 And we're talking about Mount Charleston Elementary
 5 School, and that's another elementary school with simply
 6 temporary structures. There is no foundation on them.
 7 They're temporary. And you're talking about, oh, Mount
 8 Charleston has about 430 kids.
 9 So that's our main concerns, aside from the
 10 fact that if there should be any kind of disaster with
 11 that sort of system, our schools would be used as a
 12 triad for any type of medical emergency, any type of
 13 hospitalization of victims, whether they be children,
 14 whether it be town folk. That's where they're going, is
 15 in our schools. So we're very concerned.
 16 We would like some assistance from the federal
 17 government to fix the schools that are not adequate,
 18 particularly Amargosa. I think that's a disaster
 19 waiting to happen, and we would really like some
 20 assistance with fixing those schools.
 21 A STAFF PERSON: Anything else, sir?
 22 MR. MENDEZ: No. I think that's about it.
 23 I think that, you know, we're doing -- we got
 24 a small grant for a hundred thousand to do emergency
 25 preparedness planning, and it was from the Department of

Page 7

1 Education, and we are currently in the process of doing
 2 a site audit for each of our schools, and that site
 3 audit is going to show the vulnerabilities of those
 4 sites.
 5 We are also looking for that -- that grant to
 6 provide training for our staff, our faculty, and we're
 7 looking at some desk-top exercises that would show
 8 teachers what to do in case of either fire, explosion,
 9 chemical spill. I think there's about five emergencies
 10 that they're being trained on.
 11 But, again, you know, we have a situation of
 12 what do you do in Amargosa when there's no place to go.
 13 You have a school that doesn't offer the shelter for
 14 these kids, so regardless of how much training we have,
 15 where do you put these kids? You know, unless we have
 16 bunkers that we can put them in, there really isn't
 17 anyplace to put them.
 18 I think that's a concern we want to have the
 19 federal government address.
 20 A STAFF PERSON: Thank you for your comments
 21 and thanks for coming out. Your input is what we're
 22 looking for to help us scope the issue for the EIS for
 23 the rail.
 24 MR. MENDEZ: One other thing that I might
 25 mention is that we will have our comprehensive emergency

Page 8

1 preparedness plan for the entire district, and it's in
 2 conjunction with the first providers, which is the fire,
 3 police department and so forth, within our communities.
 4 Now, most of the communities that we service
 5 -- there's seven communities in total from Gabbs all the
 6 way down to Pahrump -- they operate on volunteer fire
 7 departments. The sheriff department, of course, is
 8 there, but there really isn't any first responders that
 9 can respond to emergencies within our schools.
 10 First off, they don't have the training, they
 11 don't have the equipment, they don't have the expertise,
 12 so they would probably lose their life if they went to
 13 one of our schools in an emergency situation.
 14 A STAFF PERSON: I will recommend that you
 15 speak to some of the people at the displays and there
 16 are provisions in the new West Policy Act for emergency
 17 response training and assistance.
 18 MR. MENDEZ: As I said, we have gotten a small
 19 grant of a hundred thousand from the Department of
 20 Education and we are implementing some training. But,
 21 again, the situation shows that we don't have any way to
 22 respond to some of these emergencies within the rural
 23 scope of the small towns that we service. There isn't
 24 anything, and we want that sort of addressed because
 25 most of the high nuclear waste is coming through our

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

Page 9

1 front door and in the school yards and, you know, the
2 communities that we service. There really hasn't been
3 anything done for those communities. So that's it.

4 I would really like to be notified of any
5 funding that you guys have that we could utilize for
6 these schools. As I said, the ones that we're really
7 interested -- we have 19 schools. Three of them are
8 absolutely in need of some financing because there are
9 -- they are temporary structures with absolutely no
10 protection for the kids. So out of the 19 schools three
11 of them are real critical.

12 That's it.

13 A STAFF PERSON: Thank you again for your
14 scope and comments.

15
16 JOHN SMITH

17 MR. SMITH: John Smith. I think that the rail
18 is by far the safest means of transporting because it
19 can be more correctly monitored and watched, and like if
20 the vehicle came up behind it or anything like that,
21 it's just a whole lot safer.

22 Basically that's my comment.

23 A STAFF PERSON: Thank you.
24
25

Page 11

1 You know, we're going to end up -- I think in
2 the next year we're going to put another bottling plant
3 here and a creamery, and Nevada uses -- 40 percent of
4 Ponderosa Dairy's meat is sold here in Nevada. The rest
5 of it goes to southern California. But that's changing
6 every year. So the stuff that we have to bring in to
7 feed these cows and the structure we have to do, it
8 changes every day. It changes every day.

9 Same way with Cind-R-Lite. It was just a
10 little small company that makes cement blocks. Now it's
11 one of the biggest cement block companies in Nevada.
12 And a lot of our cinders are shipped all over the
13 country because they're just -- there's just not enough
14 sender claims in the southwest or in the United States
15 to keep them all going. So southern California is
16 shipping trucks every day to California to make cement
17 blocks.

18 So this would be a good deal for us because we
19 could actually load the car, ship it to the rail line,
20 Union Pacific, back down to southern California, and
21 that would save some trucking costs for our customers
22 there.

23 Two, we think that we need medical care, we
24 need some funding for the hospital in Pahrump so that
25 they can handle the emergencies that may -- I'm saying

Page 10

1 GARY HOLLIS

2 MR. HOLLIS: Gary Hollis, H-o-l-l-i-s, and I'm
3 a consultant. I have two big clients here in Amargosa
4 which is Cind-R-Lite Corporation and Ponderosa Dairy.

5 If this is going -- if you're going to bring
6 the rail in, we would like you to have a siting for
7 Amargosa. That way we can bring grain and corn in to
8 Ponderosa and possibly Cind-R-Lite could go back out.
9 That would also help the economic development of
10 Amargosa Valley.

11 Two, I don't want to see a dead-end rail. I
12 want to see this rail either go back and hook in to
13 Union Pacific's line in Las Vegas or go through Pahrump,
14 which a better route would be to go through Pahrump and
15 hook into the Kelso siting on the California side.
16 There's a big switching station over there. And that
17 would be the best bet, because Las Vegas already has
18 their railroad and they already have their sitings and
19 they already have their economic development from the
20 railroad.

21 What we want to see is some economic
22 development -- since this is in our back yard, we want
23 to see some economic development out for us, and
24 especially my clients, which are the big two
25 stakeholders out here.

Page 12

1 may -- come to be.

2 I've always been like this because I've worked
3 at the Nevada Test Site and I'm retired from there.
4 I've worked there for 20 something years. I've had to
5 work around radioactivity and I'm not scared of it. But
6 I can understand people that haven't had any contact
7 with radiation and it should scare them. You should be
8 ascaed of it. But we had the same thing when we
9 invented electricity. Everybody was scared of the light
10 bulbs up there.

11 The thing of it is I'm more in favor of Yucca
12 Mountain than some of my clients are, but I'm paid, I'm
13 paid to represent my clients, but I assured them,
14 though, that, you know, that this is not going to be --
15 if something happens and it kills all your cows, DOE is
16 going to be in deep trouble and they will be making you
17 new dairies in the midwest somewhere. And the same way
18 with my other client.

19 I don't think that it's going to be up to the
20 State of Nevada whether this repository goes or not. I
21 believe it's going to be up to the President of the
22 United States, and first I would like to see something
23 out of this for Nye County.

24 I appreciate your hearing my complaints.

25 A STAFF PERSON: Thank you.

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

Page 13

1 JOHN SMITH

2 MR. SMITH: One other small thing I would like
3 to add. They're talking about a one-mile corridor and
4 turning it back in to use. I would keep that with
5 one-mile corridor for security reasons. In other words,
6 you put a fence on each side, and that way if anybody
7 wanders through the area, you have a chance to spot them
8 quicker than if it's right beside.

9 So from the standpoint of security, I think
10 they should have a one-mile corridor, half mile at least
11 on each side. That's just my suggestion.

12 A STAFF PERSON: Thank you.

13 MORGAN LYNN

14 MR. LYNN: First name Morgan, M-o-r-g-a-n,
15 last name Lynn, L-y-n-n. And I live right here. I live
16 across the street. And I'm a native Nevadan. I know
17 the country pretty good. I've been around.

18 319 miles to negotiate from Caliente to Yucca
19 Mountain? Has anybody got in a jeep and driven that?
20 What? That's tough country. My question is you see
21 that dark line out there. You want to come here and
22 look at it?

24 (Brief pause.)

25 A STAFF PERSON: DOE followed the speaker out

Page 15

1 a reality. I think it's just a big bluff to justify
2 trucking on the highways.

3 Well, you probably don't live out here. I do.
4 Lived here for 30 years. We have these canisters coming
5 down through here with NHP and CHP saying we're hauling
6 ammunition from Nevada Test Site to Albuquerque.

7 Well, what the hell you need to haul
8 ammunition from here to Albuquerque?

9 Then we get the big old thing, look at it
10 here, boy, we made this trip, no problems at all, this
11 and that and the other thing. They're justifying
12 trucking.

13 I'll tell you another thing. I'm not pointing
14 at you. On the original town board here, 1981, I
15 believe it was, they showed us films of these trucks
16 with the canisters on them running into brick walls.
17 They're still showing the same films 20 odd years later.
18 Haven't they done any more research?

19 I mean give me a break. They came out, said,
20 oh, boy, town board, you know what? We're going to
21 bring in 3,000 construction workers, 800 permanent
22 people. If we got six at Yucca Mountain right now, I'll
23 eat my hat.

24 Well, I mean it's just the durn truth, by
25 golly. And if you're going to spend the taxpayer's

Page 14

1 to the window.

2 MR. LYNN: At any rate I have mentioned that I
3 was on the original town board here in Amargosa, I was
4 the fire chief for five years, and I have mentioned this
5 at many meetings. Why don't they use the old T&T grid?
6 Half the distance, no mountains to negotiate, and
7 established grade. They pulled the steam engine a
8 hundred years ago, goes right straight to Highway 95,
9 Ludlow, Baker, Dumont Dunes, Solarian Valley, Tobega
10 Canyon. Shoshone, Death Valley Junction, right up here.
11 Half the distance, no mountains to negotiate,
12 established grid, big percentage of grade still there.

13 You wouldn't encounter so much as a horned
14 toad I think out there. I mean you're going through
15 pine trees, branches, cattle grazing, sheep grazing, 319
16 miles over those hills. If you can put in there
17 (shaking head), shucks, I just don't get it.

18 And who is going to pay for this? No comment?
19 Taxpayers, right? So if you can go half the distance,
20 don't have to negotiate mountain ranges on established
21 grid for the big percentage of the grade already built,
22 why won't we do it?

23 A STAFF PERSON: End of comment?

24 MR. LYNN: What else could you say -- I will
25 say this. Personally I don't think the railroad is even

Page 16

1 money to build a railroad in here, you know, the federal
2 government and the environmentalists -- I worked in the
3 mines the biggest part of my life in Death Valley; and
4 between the park service, the federal government and
5 environmentalists, they shut all the mining down. There
6 was a time in Shoshone you couldn't find a lamp post to
7 lean on. Now you can't even find a dog to run down
8 there.

9 No. Maybe something like a railroad would
10 give those little communities a boost here.

11 This area here, I don't know how many people
12 would agree with me. You want a nuclear train running
13 through here, but if you're going to have Yucca Mountain
14 up here across the highway, maybe the railroad would
15 bring some prosperity.

16 Nevada is a free port state. You can store
17 things here. Maybe the railroad would help with that.

18 But my big point is why are we considering 319
19 miles over some of the most treacherous, roughest
20 mountain ranges in the state of Nevada when you have
21 established grade half the distance with no mountains to
22 encounter and a good portion of the grade intact.

23 Hope somebody reads this.

24 A STAFF PERSON: Thank you.

25

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

Page 17

1 GARY ADAMS

2 MR. ADAMS: Gary Adams.

3 Specifically I want to be on the mailing list
4 for the draft environmental statement for the railroad,
5 rail corridor, so I can see whether you addressed my
6 concerns or not. So you can guarantee me that I'll get
7 a copy of this? I won't have to be watching the Federal
8 Register or something to be sure I don't get missed?

9 I wrote up that material, but I did not put my
10 name on it because I thought I would I make several
11 comments or ask several questions when I wrote that up.

12 One that I didn't put in there that I would
13 like to add, looking at the alternative rail corridors,
14 it would appear that they could use the existing
15 railroad from Caliente down to just north of the Moapa
16 Indian Reservation, and then they could follow the
17 existing highway over to highway 93 and figure out a
18 route that they would come just south of the bombing
19 range along Highway 95, and rough estimate would be
20 maybe a hundred miles for new construction as opposed to
21 400 miles the other way.

22 So it would have to be a whole lot cheaper and
23 I don't think there's any potentially adverse
24 environmental effects, still far enough away from Las
25 Vegas so the big money people shouldn't be concerned.

Page 18

1 In other words, specifically I think they need
2 to revisit the route, look at other alternatives.

3 As I stated in what I wrote up there, the
4 first question to me that needs to be asked is, which
5 still hasn't been answered, will the railroad be
6 operated solely as a private federal railroad
7 exclusively for transporting radioactive material or
8 will it be used -- can it be used for other uses as
9 well. And I feel that I have to assume that unless DOE
10 is willing to go on the record in writing saying that it
11 would be allowed to be used for something else or that
12 it only be for exclusive use of the radioactive
13 material. If that's the case, there's no benefit to any
14 of the communities for the railroad coming through and
15 impacting the private Indian lands.

16 And I feel strongly that they should look at
17 again putting this as much as possible on the test
18 range.

19 And I understand that there were secret
20 meetings held to say what the defense concerns were, but
21 having worked personally with the Air Force in the past,
22 I don't trust them.

23 So I'm concerned about why we can't put this
24 predominantly on existing government land that's already
25 been set aside. I call specific point to the Goldwater

Page 19

1 test runs in southwestern Arizona which has both a
2 railroad and a highway on it.

3 So what is different about the Nellis testing
4 bombing range as opposed to the Goldwater range?

5 I'm restating some of what I wrote there, but
6 the Bonnie Clare West route goes almost right down the
7 middle of the Timbisha Shoshone lands. It's my
8 understanding that federal law forbids taking Indian
9 lands if there is any reasonable alternative. In this
10 case there's many reasonable alternatives. All they
11 have to do is shift the railroad about three miles to
12 the west. They can avoid the Indian lands and all the
13 private lands in the area.

14 There's also the abandoned railroad bed which
15 they're utilizing a little bit further to the north.
16 They could follow further south as well to avoid that.

17 Of course, if we're being told that they can't
18 reconsider the other alternatives, my personal opinion
19 is that the railroad should skirt on the exterior edge
20 of the test range and be exclusively on the test range.
21 It would create a physical barrier to people coming on
22 the test range.

23 And I can't speak for the whole perimeter,
24 which is obviously hundreds of miles, but in Scotty's
25 Junction area there are no signs, no barriers, no

Page 20

1 warnings of any kind, so that you don't even know when
2 you're getting onto the bombing range. I know because
3 I've studied the quad sheets on them.

4 So the advantage of putting the railroad on
5 the perimeter would provide a physical barrier. And my
6 observation is in that area that there is absolutely no
7 use for bombing purposes or any others other than
8 possibly as a buffer to lands further to the interior.
9 So I have a very great hard time understanding how there
10 would be any impact to national defense utilizing land
11 that is not being utilized currently.

12 So to recap, my first choice would be to put
13 it on as much of the test range as we can. If that is
14 totally out of the question, we should run it on the
15 perimeter as much as possible. If that is out of the
16 question, then when you look at the Bonnie Clare West
17 alternate, that should be eliminated and dropped from
18 consideration because of coming through the Indian
19 lands, or in the alternative it should be shifted to the
20 west to avoid the Indian lands.

21 Also, if a Bonnie Clare West alternative is
22 further considered, there must be road level separation
23 where it crosses west 95 two places. It would be a bad
24 day if a semi-tractor trailer rig runs into one of these
25 trains.

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

Page 21

1 I am a land owner that is directly affected by
2 the Bonnie Clare West route. This comes pretty much
3 through the middle of my property. It will screw up two
4 of my proposed pivots which will not be able to be
5 installed if the railroad is constructed as currently
6 planned.

7 The documents that I have read state
8 specifically that DOE will mitigate land use conflicts.
9 The best way to avoid a conflict is to eliminate it. So
10 if you shift the railroad to the west, it will eliminate
11 the conflict of both Indian and private lands.

12 I guess one of the questions I asked that
13 nobody had a real good answer for, the current shipments
14 -- the shipments that would come to Caliente will come
15 from and through other major metropolitan areas, like
16 Chicago, Denver. Why is Vegas different than these
17 other cities? Why was the big concern about the
18 railroad getting too close to Vegas? How far do we need
19 to stay away from Vegas to avoid that concern? Will
20 somebody actually be sending me answers to these
21 questions?

22 But since I'm bringing them to you, they will
23 be addressed in the impact statement?

24 Okay. Well, obviously the current proposed
25 route is estimated at 880 million dollars in 2001 money.

Page 22

1 My estimate, also being a government employee, is it
2 will be at least twice that before you get it built. If
3 this railroad is to be used exclusively as a private
4 federal railroad for the transport of federal materials,
5 why do we want to build a one-time use railroad? Why
6 not use the truck routes?

7 We need to go back and think about that.

8 One or two deaths per year estimated. Nobody
9 knows what's actually going to happen. That was the
10 only -- looking at the documents I looked at, that was
11 the only significant difference that I could see as far
12 as real negative impact. Of course, the cost would be
13 substantially less using existing roads instead of
14 building a railroad.

15 Again, it would be substantially less if you
16 used a more direct route.

17 That combined with what I have written I think
18 pretty well covers my concerns.

19 Well, one other question, though. If all else
20 fails and they force this railroad to come through my
21 property, I've been planning my project for over 20
22 years, and I had my water secured for this basin, which
23 is no good in no other basin.

24 So if you're going to steal part of my land
25 through eminent domain, can I get similar lands in the

Page 23

1 same basin? Could I get similar lands in the same basin
2 that replace any lands that you take as well as -- see,
3 how do I say this? Would you have to mitigate -- the
4 irrigation plan will not work if you drive right through
5 the middle of it. I plan to put pivots in. If you run
6 something through the middle, it can't go all the way
7 around. So it's a major factor.

8 I guess that would be my concern. If you're
9 going to steal my grounds and screw up my current plan,
10 can we get ground in the same area, the same general
11 quality to replace it?

12 I think that pretty well covers it.

13 A STAFF PERSON: Thank you.

14 MR. ADAMS: If I understood correctly, all of
15 my comments and concerns will be addressed in the impact
16 statement? If they're not addressed, when I get my
17 draft copy, what do I do then?

18 Also, sneaking out an item in the Federal
19 Register on December 29th, when everybody is happy about
20 Christmas, is totally inappropriate. It's like they
21 were trying to sneak it by so people wouldn't notice it.

22 And somebody made the statement that they
23 weren't planning on doing any more environmental
24 assessment work, which, of course, is totally not
25 allowed for the rail line. You're going to have to do

Page 24

1 an assessment.

2 A STAFF PERSON: Thank you.

3
4 PAULINE ESTEVES and GERALDINE ESTEVES
5 MS. P. ESTEVES: Pauline Esteves.

6 I'm member of the Timbisha Shoshone, and from
7 the maps I'm looking at, the railway alignment is to
8 come through our land there at Scotty's Junction, and I
9 oppose that. And I understand that the map was formed
10 before -- before we acquired that parcel of land there
11 at Scotty's Junction, and I say that DOE should go and
12 put it back on the table again and draw another map and
13 start all over again because we weren't being considered
14 then because we didn't have that parcel of land till the
15 year of 2000, the year of 2000. Clinton signed it.

16 And that's the most important thing.

17 And there's other options that I see on the
18 map, and that again -- you know, that needs to be
19 addressed because it's very close to that -- to that
20 parcel of land there on either side, on the west side or
21 on the east side.

22 I think that's it.

23 So, therefore, I do not want it to go through
24 the parcel of land there, or even the east side of it or
25 on the west side.

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

Page 25

1 MS. G. ESTEVES: On the part of tourism and
2 park services, remember, for economic development?

3 MS. P. ESTEVES: Park Service has their
4 employees living there at Scotty's Castle, and that is
5 the only route that takes anyone to Scotty's Castle,
6 whether it's visitors or employees, and they wanted
7 through an agreement with the Timbisha Shoshone to
8 purchase housing there because park service cannot use
9 any of the lands within the park for housing.

10 So through an agreement, that was within the
11 Homeland Act, and we were to build so many units there
12 to house their employees. And that road there that is
13 west of our parcel there from Scotty's Junction, that's
14 the road that they will be traveling back and forth to
15 go to work, to commute. And it was that source of
16 economic development for us. It's all laid out in the
17 Homeland Act.

18 A STAFF PERSON: Thank you.

19
20 ED HANSON

21 MR. HANSON: Ed Hanson, H-a-n-s-o-n, from
22 Pahrump. I live in Pahrump. I have 45 years in nuclear
23 program, weapons program.

24 I believe in nuclear and I have no problem
25 with the nuclear waste coming to Nevada. I do have -- I

Page 27

1 We used to transport the nuclear weapons,
2 mostly by rail and by air, too, at that time. They
3 stopped that in the late '80s. That was because of
4 terrorists. They were afraid of ambushing.

5 But I think this good rail transportation,
6 good security, it's not a problem.

7 A STAFF PERSON: Thank you very much.

8
9 FREDERICK GEORGE TUCKER

10 MR. TUCKER: Frederick, F-r-e-d-e-r-i-c-k,
11 George, G-e-o-r-g-e, last name Tucker, T-u-c-k-e-r.

12 I live here in Amargosa Valley, just across
13 the road from [REDACTED]

14 I have in my hand a proposed route for
15 shipping nuclear waste to the Nevada Test Site. It
16 seems to me on the face of it is a total waste of
17 taxpayer's money. It seems as though the railroad is at
18 least twice as long as it need be.

19 I would like to know who -- and that's names,
20 committees -- who proposed this and why. Do we have a
21 proposed cost for this railroad?

22 And I'm wondering whether whatever contracting
23 company is going to be building this has any association
24 with current administration like so many other
25 boondoggled taxpayer expenses.

Page 26

1 do -- I want the rail transportation. I think that's
2 the safest way to go. I want to see rail spurs. I want
3 to see public use of the rail. I really want to see it
4 not dead end. I want to see it go all the way to Jean
5 or wherever it ties in.

6 A STAFF PERSON: Rail spurs, where, if I may?

7 MR. HANSON: Tonopah, Beatty, Amargosa,
8 possibly to Pahrump.

9 I want to see the economic development. I
10 think for the road -- over-the-road transportation that
11 comes in, the roads need to be improved, all to four
12 lane and heavy duty for the loads.

13 I want to see support for hospitals and
14 hazardous material teams. I am on the Nye County
15 Hazardous Material now, doing fairly well with the funds
16 that come in from the low level waste. I would like to
17 see better communications, all the dead spots in the
18 county, economic development.

19 A STAFF PERSON: Anything else, sir?

20 MR. HANSON: Did I forget anything?

21 A STAFF PERSON: No. No. Thank you very
22 much.

23 MR. HANSON: I really have no problems with
24 transporting. I really feel that rail is the safest
25 way.

Page 28

1 I think at this time I don't have much --
2 enough information to comment farther except for what
3 I've already said.

4 This looks preposterous costwise. I don't
5 accept any comment, like, well, the Department of
6 Defense said we couldn't run it straight through their
7 place. Why not?

8 Okay. I'm done. Thank you.

9 A STAFF PERSON: Thank you, sir. Appreciate
10 your comments, sir.

11
12 (Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Page 29

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF NEVADA)

) ss

COUNTY OF CLARK)

I, Wanda L. McInerney, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I took down in Stenotype all of the proceedings had in the before-entitled matter at the time and place indicated and that thereafter said shorthand notes were transcribed into typewriting at and under my direction and supervision and that the foregoing transcript constitutes a full, true and accurate record of the proceedings had.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal in my office in the County of Clark, State of Nevada, this 4th day of May, 2004.

Wanda L. McInerney, CCR No. 676, RPR

8 (Page 29)